

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,060	11/25/2003	Donal Coveney	122359.00003 (TOMK-0001)	4165
JACKSON WA	7590 01/22/2007 .LKER LLP		EXAMINER	
901 MAIN STR			OH, TAYLOR V	
SUITE 6000 DALLAS, TX 75202-3797			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1625	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/22/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del> – –
	10/722,060	COVENEY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Taylor Victor Oh	1625	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cl after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report.  In a seriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION.  ly be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2</li> <li>This action is FINAL. 2b)</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und</li> </ol>	This action is non-final. owance except for formal matte	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,7-9 and 12-14 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) 3 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,7,9,12 and 14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2,4,8, and 13 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	ndrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the continuous The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance or rection is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	. •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in App priority documents have been re preau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application	

Art Unit: 1625

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### The Status of Claims:

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-14 are pending.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 12, 14 are rejected.

Claim 3 is allowable.

Claims 2, 4, 8, and 13 are objected.

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

**Priority** 

1. None.

**Drawings** 

2. None.

## **Claim Objections**

Claims 2, 4, 8, and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1625

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 7, 9,12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated clearly by Harris et al (WO 02/44121 A1).

Harris et al discloses the following compound below (see page 13, lines 1-3):

Furthermore, this compound as a part of the formula I (see page 9, lines 10-18) can be used in pharmaceutical composition for the treatment of HIV-1 (see page 11, lines 14-19). This is identical with the claims.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 1625

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 7, 9,12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al (WO 02/44121 A1) in view of Aldrich (page 811, 1999).

Art Unit: 1625

Harris et al discloses the pyrogallol p-Br-phenyl tetramer product (see page 24, lines 8-9).

Furthermore, this compound as a part of the formula I (see page 9, lines 10-18) can be used in pharmaceutical composition for the treatment of HIV-1 (see page 11, lines 14-19).

However, the instant invention differs from the prior art in that the claimed R<sub>2</sub> group is para-fluorobenzene instead of the para-bromobenzene group.

Even so, the instant invention is belonged to the halogen family in which the bromine and the fluorine have a similar reactivity between them; furthermore, they are related to each other with respect to the positional isomers. It is obvious to the skilled artisan in the art to be motivated to substitute the known fluoride group to the paraposition instead of the meta position of the benzene group in the absence of an unexpected result.

Harris expressly teaches the method of producing the pyrogallol p-Br-phenyl tetramer product (see page 24, lines 8-9). The reactivity between the bromine and the fluorine is similar to each other because of the same periodic family. Therefore, if the skilled artisan in the art had desired to make the cyclic tetrameric pyrogallol-aldehyde derivatives having the para-fluorobenzene group as the R<sub>2</sub> group, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan in the art to be motivated to use the Aldrich's p-fluorobenzaldehyde as the starting material in the Harry's process as an alternative

Application/Control Number: 10/722,060 Page 6

Art Unit: 1625

because the skilled artisan in the art would expect such a modification to be successful as shown in the Harry process due to the equivalency of their reactivity between the bromine and the fluorine substituents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taylor Victor Oh whose telephone number is 571-272-0689. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie can be reached on 571-272-0670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Taylor Victor Oh, MSD,LAC

Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1625

(/11/07